

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,885	08/26/2003	John Hoard	E-13657	4876
7590 05/02/2007 Douglas E. McKinley, Jr. McKinley Law Office			EXAMINER	
			JOHNSON, EDWARD M	
P.O. Box 202 Richland, WA 99352			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

/	
0	

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/648,885	HOARD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Edward M. Johnson	1754					
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNION R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reprise of the second second will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become All	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. EANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final. owance except for formal matt	•					
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the applicated 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rrection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview 9	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application					

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is a non-final re-mailing of the Office Action in response to Applicant's telephone communication that the recently submitted papers were incorrectly labeled with the wrong serial number.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/648,885

Art Unit: 1754

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 9-21, 29-41, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeba et al. US 6,093,378.

Regarding claims 1, 21, and 41, Deeba '378 discloses a method for treating exhaust containing NOx comprising treatment with a first and second zeolite component (abstract), wherein the first component may be a barium Y zeolite (see column 11, lines 27-40), and reduces NOx at temperatures of about 150, 175-350, or up to about 325 degrees C (see column 8, lines 18-24). Deeba '378 further discloses pores of at least about 5 Angstroms (see column 10, lines 23-27), the second component comprising silver (see column 4, lines 42-46), and supported on gamma alumina (see column 12, lines 10-14 and column 8, lines 35-37).

Deeba '378 fails to disclose converting a portion of the gas stream to a reducing gas.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to convert a portion of

Application/Control Number: 10/648,885

Art Unit: 1754

the gas stream to a reducing gas because Deeba discloses the barium zeolite composition traps hydrocarbons and releases as reducing agent (see column 8, lines 13-19), which would motivate an ordinary artisan to trap the hydrocarbons as disclosed and convert them to reducing agent to be used in NOx conversion, as disclosed.

Regarding claims 9-11, 14-15, 29-31, 34-35, and 49, Deeba '378 discloses the first component may be a barium Y zeolite (see column 11, lines 27-40) with an exchangeable Na cation (see claim 16).

Regarding claims 12-13 and 32-33, Deeba '378 pores of at least about 5 Angstroms (see column 10, lines 23-27).

Regarding claims 16-20 and 36-40, Deeba '378 discloses the

second component comprising silver (see column 4, lines 42-46) or In (see column 11, lines 49-54) and supported on gamma alumina (see column 12, lines 10-14 and column 8, lines 35-37).

6. Claims 2-8, 22-28, and 42-48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeba '378 as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above, and further in view of Balko et al. US 6,176,078.

Regarding claims 2-4, 22-24, 42-44, Deeba '378 fails to disclose acetaldehyde and formaldehyde.

Balko '078 discloses acetaldehyde and formaldehyde.

Art Unit: 1754

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the acetaldehyde and/or formaldehyde of Balko in the NOx reduction over silver alumina zeolite process of Deeba because Balko discloses the acetaldehyde and formaldehyde for use in NOx control (title) which exhibits improved NOx reduction in a silver aluminate catalyst (column 7, lines 62-63).

Regarding 5-8, 25-28, 45-48, Balko '078 discloses the presence of plasma to induce a number of reactions which produce molecules ideally suited for reducing agent (abstract).

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Grasselli et al. US 5,374,410 discloses a NOx effluent abatement process comprising reducing the effluent reducing NOx at 200-600 degrees C over zeolite (see abstract and Examples); Yamamoto et al. US 6,047,544 discloses NOx purification comprising contact with zeolite hydrocarbon absorbent formed on alumina substrate and having specific dimensions (see abstract and description).
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1352 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1754

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley S. Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward M. Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754

EMJ